

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMEI United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/674,681 09/29/2003		Stuart Peirson	4586-4001	5505	
27123	7590 06/27/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER			KIM, YOUNG J		
	NY 10281-2101		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		1637		
			DATE MAILED: 06/27/200	DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•			Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/674,681	PEIRSON ET A	PEIRSON ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit					
•			Young J. Kim	1637				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun r Reply	nication appo	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence a	address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE N sions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come period for reply is specified above, the maximum si re to reply within the set or extended period for reply eply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DA s of 37 CFR 1.13 munication. tatutory period wi y will, by statute,	TE OF THIS COMMUNI 6(a). In no event, however, may a Il apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on						
2a)□			action is non-final.					
3)	<u> </u>							
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)□	6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.							
•	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by th	ne Examiner						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to	o by the Exa	aminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form F	PTO-152.			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a)[a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* 0	application from the internation and the second see the attached detailed Office action		, , , ,	received				
	oo tile attached detailed office delic	on tor a not c	n the continue copies had					
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)			Summary (PTO-413)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (I nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or			s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (P	TO-152)			
	r No(s)/Mail Date		6) 🔲 Other:		·			

Art Unit: 1637

DETAILED ACTION

Preliminary Remark

Claim 34 refers to claim 15 as a "method." However, claim 15 is a product (i.e., a system).

Thus, for the purpose of the present restriction requirement, an assumption is made that claim 34 is drawn to a system, as inferred by its dependence on claim 15.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-14, 22-25, 32, 33, and 35, drawn to a method of analyzing the efficiency of a polymerase chain reaction, involving the estimation of a slope of dependence of a logarithm of the signal on cycle number, classified in class 702, subclass 86.
- II. Claims 15-21 and 34, drawn to a system which performs an analysis of a polymerase chain reaction, classified in class 702, subclass 127.
- III. Claims 26-31, drawn to a method of calculating the initial load of a biological product, classified in class 435, subclass 91.2. If this Group is elected, further species election is required.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and III are unrelated to each other. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions involve different steps to achieve a different outcome (e.g., determining how efficient the PCR is versus a method of determining the initial load of a gene or virus).

Invention II is related to Inventions I and III as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using

the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the system of Group II can be used in an either of the methods of Groups I and III.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Further Species requirement for Group III

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

- a) determining the initial load of a virus or bacteria (claim 28); and
- b) determining the initial load of a gene (claims 29-31).

The species are independent or distinct because the methods are directed toward the determination of different analyte, wherein these methods would require searches, which are not coextensive in scope.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 26 and 27 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable

generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

A telephone call was not made to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement due to the complex nature of the requirement (MPEP § 812.01).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Young J. Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-0785. The Examiner is on flex-time schedule and can best be reached from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. The Examiner can also be reached via e-mail to Young.Kim@uspto.gov. However, the office cannot guarantee security through the e-mail system nor should official papers be transmitted through this route.

Art Unit: 1637

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Dr. Gary Benzion, can be reached at (571) 272-0782.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1637 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 CFR 1.6(d)). NOTE: If applicant does submit a paper by FAX, the original copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED, so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office. All official documents must be sent to the Official Tech Center Fax number: (571) 273-8300. For Unofficial documents, faxes can be sent directly to the Examiner at (571) 273-0785. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Young J. Kim Primary Examiner

Art Unit 163/ 6/26/2006 YOUNG J. KIM
PATENT EXAMINER